Collier County Public Schools

Sabal Palm Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sabal Palm Elementary School

4095 18TH AVE NE, Naples, FL 34120

https://www.collierschools.com/spe

Demographics

Principal: Jessica Davis

Start Date for this Principal: 6/4/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Collier County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Sabal Palm Elementary School

4095 18TH AVE NE, Naples, FL 34120

https://www.collierschools.com/spe

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	73%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	71%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Collier County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide an enthusiastic learning experience and high quality education that will empower students to become global citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To create a challenging, differentiated learning environment that inspires students and staff members to be independent, lifelong learners.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Jonas, Stephanie	Principal	The Principal engages all stakeholders and leads curriculum initiatives to ensure quality instruction to increase student achievement.
Mannari, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal collaborates with stakeholders and supports curriculum and instruction initiatives to increase student achievement.
Phillips, Debra	Reading Coach	The Reading Coach collaborates with stakeholders and coaches teachers in quality literacy instructional techniques to increase student achievement.
Flatley, Jamie	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor collaborates with stakeholders and supports district and school Social Emotional Learning initiatives to increase student achievement.
Valdes, Mabel	ELL Compliance Specialist	The ELL Specialist collaborates with stakeholders and supports the education of students learning English as their second language to increase student achievement.
Marr, Michelle	Other	The ESE Specialist collaborates with stakeholders and supports district and school ESE programs and works and helps to ensure all procedural safe guards are followed for students with disabilities.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 6/4/2018, Jessica Davis

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

Total number of students enrolled at the school

595

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	86	83	71	103	103	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	542
Attendance below 90 percent	4	10	11	11	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	1	9	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in Math	1	6	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	14	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	23	18	19	18	15	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	112

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	5	1	6	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	8	5	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/26/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	64	77	90	96	108	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	532
Attendance below 90 percent	4	13	4	5	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	2	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	1	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	64	77	90	96	108	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	532
Attendance below 90 percent	4	13	4	5	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	2	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	1	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				67%	60%	57%	58%	61%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				58%	59%	58%	50%	62%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	51%	53%	39%	54%	48%
Math Achievement				70%	68%	63%	72%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains				54%	64%	62%	59%	65%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				33%	55%	51%	35%	55%	47%
Science Achievement				51%	59%	53%	48%	60%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2021					
	2019	72%	61%	11%	58%	14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	64%	58%	6%	58%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
05	2021					
	2019	59%	60%	-1%	56%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2021					
	2019	80%	68%	12%	62%	18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	64%	65%	-1%	64%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
05	2021					
	2019	63%	67%	-4%	60%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	51%	56%	-5%	53%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

In 1st and 2nd grade we progress monitored students in ELA with iReady Diagnostic Testing. In 3rd- 5th grade we progress monitored students in ELA and Math with Collier District created Quarterly Benchmark Assessments and FSA.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(10/67) 15%	No Scores	(51/74) 69%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(7/57) 12%	No Scores	(4/5) 80%
	Students With Disabilities	(3/14) 21%	No Scores	(10/14) 71%
	English Language Learners	(2/18) 11%	No Scores	(12/20) 60%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(41/95) 43%	No Scores	(64/94) 68%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(29/68) 43%	No Scores	(48/68) 71%
	Students With Disabilities	(2/15) 13%	No Scores	(4/17) 24%
	English Language Learners	(5/25) 20%	No Scores	(12/24) 50%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(43/88) 49%	(51/91) 56%	(45/92) 49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(34/71) 48%	(40/73) 55%	(33/73) 45%
	Students With Disabilities	(11/24) 46%	(10/22) 45%	(10/20) 50%
	English Language Learners	(11/30) 37%	(11/30) 37%	(12/29) 41%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(45/89) 51%	(52/91) 57%	(49/91) 54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(34/72) 47%	(39/73) 53%	(37/72) 51%
	Students With Disabilities	(10/24) 42%	(12/22) 55%	(12/20) 60%
	English Language Learners	(12/30) 40%	(14/30) 47%	(12/29) 41%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(56/101) 55%	(64/102) 63%	(67/103) 65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(41/76) 54%	(49/76) 64%	(47/76) 62%
	Students With Disabilities	(6/18) 33%	(6/18) 33%	(5/18) 28%
	English Language Learners	(7/21) 33%	(8/21) 38%	(8/21) 38%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(67/99) 68%	(78/102) 76%	(51/102) 50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(49/75) 65%	(57/76) 75%	(38/76) 50%
	Students With Disabilities	(7/18) 39%	(11/18) 61%	(3/19) 16%
	English Language Learners	(9/21) 43%	(12/21) 57%	(7/21) 33%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(47/91) 52%	(55/94) 59%	(47/95) 49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(25/55) 45%	(28/58) 48%	(24/58) 41%
	Students With Disabilities	(7/14) 50%	(7/15) 47%	(4/13) 31%
	English Language Learners	(5/19) 26%	(5/20) 25%	(7/20) 35%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(56/92) 61%	(54/92) 59%	(36/95) 38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(32/56) 57%	(28/56) 50%	(16/58) 28%
	Students With Disabilities	(9/14) 64%	10/15) 67%	(4/13) 31%
	English Language Learners	(10/19) 53%	(10/19) 53%	(4/20) 20%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(39/89) 44%	(47/89) 53%	(44/89) 49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(17/54) 31%	(24/53) 45%	(21/52) 40%
	Students With Disabilities	(5/12) 42%	(7/15) 47%	(3/11) 27%
	English Language Learners	(2/19) 11%	(6/19) 32%	(6/19) 32%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	**ELA Ach.**	**ELA LG**	**ELA LG L25%**	**Math Ach.**	**Math LG**	**Math LG L25%**	**Sci Ach.**	**SS Ach.**	**MS Accel.**	**Grad Rate 2019-20**	**C & C Accel 2019-20**
SWD	36	56		49	63		46				
ELL	48	50	55	58	41		38				
BLK	43			29							
HSP	62	48	54	68	44	42	55				
WHT	68	58		64	42		70				
FRL	61	47	60	64	37	37	47				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	**ELA Ach.**	**ELA LG**	**ELA LG L25%**	**Math Ach.**	**Math LG**	**Math LG L25%**	**Sci Ach.**	**SS Ach.**	**MS Accel.**	**Grad Rate 2017-18**	**C & C Accel 2017-18**
SWD	44	57	42	54	66	50	21				
ELL	61	65	50	64	47	38	43				
BLK	53			60							
HSP	66	59	42	71	53	40	48				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
WHT	70	58	60	70	55	25	52				
FRL	61	55	46	64	51	33	45				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	28	32	33	52	42	25	18				
ELL	47	39		79	72	50	10				
BLK	50			57							
HSP	52	41	32	72	59	37	37				
WHT	68	66	56	73	57	31	67				
FRL	56	47	30	71	56	30	41				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	440
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	50
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	60
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

In ELA our 1st Graders made significant gains from the beginning of the year (BOY) to the end of the year (EOY) in 1st grade. In 2nd grade, the category of "All" students, Economically Disadvantaged students, and EL Learners showed significant increases from the BOY to EOY. SWD in 2nd grade showed less of an increase. In 3rd-5th grade ELA, we saw less change from the BOY to the EOY in the "All" students category and in each student group on our Progress Monitoring Tools (Quarter 1 and 2 ELA Benchmark Assessments) to ELA FSA.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

From SY19 to SY21 our student performance in Math for students identified in the lowest 25% increased from 33% to 39% proficient. This is below our district and the state average. In addition, students making Overall Math Gains decreased from 54% to 41%.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

We did not see Overall Math Proficiency decline in the same way that Math Overall Gains declined. One contributing factor was that we had a teacher who taught 2 blocks of math on leave for almost 2 quarters of the school year. Only 23% of those students made their Overall Learning Gains in Math. Due to the fact that they were above grade level when they entered 5th grade, the majority of the students were still in the proficient range on Spring FSA. For this reason, Proficiency Levels in Math did not decrease in the same way as Overall Learning Gains. Given a similar situation this school year with a teacher in 4th grade, we have a Leadership Team member pushing in each day to teach the entire math block until the teacher returns to the classroom.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Our Lowest 25% Making Reading Gains increased from 39% to 47% to 57% from SY18 to SY21. We attribute this to targeted interventions that align with the ELA standards in 3rd-5th grades.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Students in 3rd-5th grade were instructed with on grade level standards, with one grade level below text the week prior to that ELA standard being taught in their classroom. This occurred during the ELA intervention block. By accessing the text more fluently (one grade level below) and applying the grade level standard, our students were more proficient in applying the grade level standard to on grade level text the following week. This was evidenced weekly on Standards Mastery assessments.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Students will be instructed during the entire Reading Block with on grade level text. In the past, a significant part of the Reading Block was dedicated to differentiated instruction based on students' present reading level. Beginning this school year, students will engage in accessing on grade level text throughout the Reading block. Students will be supported with strategies while they 'productively

struggle' to increase their fluency and comprehension of on grade level text. Teacher will scaffold and differentiated instruction to meet then needs of all students.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

All teachers received 2 full days of training to teach on grade level ELA standards with on grade level text. During this training, the B.E.S.T. Standards in ELA were integrated into the adopted reading series, Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, lessons. This training supported teachers' understanding of the philosophy of giving students access to on grade level text in order to increase learning gains and reduce the learning gap that occurs after years of not being taught with on grade level text.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Teachers have a Collaborative Planning day, once a week, in the morning that focuses on ELA instruction utilizing B.E.S.T. Standards. This will build capacity in all teachers being able to effectively teach the B.E.S.T. Standards this year and beyond. We have also added a 30 minute block of time where all students will receive interventions based on their needs. This time will focus on enrichment and/or remediation activities to meet the needs of all learners.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our Area of Focus is to Increase Overall Learning Gains in Math. This area has decreased in the last 5 school years from 55% making gains to 41% making gains and had a 13% decrease from 2019-2021. By focusing on Increasing Learning Gains in Math, we intend to increase the percentage of students who make learning gains in Math by 5%, from 41% to 46% making learning gains measured by the school year 2022 FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	By June 2022, If students are consistently engaged in differentiated cognitively complex activities, utilizing HMH Resources and by following the district scope and sequence, that require active processing and engagement, then the overall learning gains of students will increase by 5%, from 41%-46%, in Math.
Monitoring:	SPE Leadership Team will monitor the following, bi-weekly; HMH Math Module Assessments, HMH Math growth monitoring tool and ALEKS math program. In addition, SPE Leadership Team will analyze our Quarter 1, 2, & 3 Benchmark Assessments, quarterly, and respond with interventions or changes as needed from our data analysis. Administration will ensure lesson plans are reviewed weekly and include differentiated instruction, ELL, ESE, and enrichment strategies.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephanie Jonas (jonasst@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	- Implement tasks that promote reasoning and problem solving - Pose purposeful questions - Support productive struggle in learning mathematics
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	- Engage students in solving and discussing tasks that promote mathematical reasoning and problem solving and allow multiple entry points and varied solution strategies. - Use purposeful questions to assess and advance students' reasoning and sense making about important mathematical ideas and relationships. - Consistently provide students, individually and collectively, with opportunities and supports to engage in productive struggle as they grapple with mathematical ideas and relationships

Action Steps to Implement	
Professional Development in effective math instruction and intervention strategies.	
Person Responsible	Kimberly Mannari (mannak@collierschools.com)
Data chats with grade level teams regarding individual student data to move them along a continuum, monitoring their progress throughout the year based on common and district assessments.	
Person Responsible	Stephanie Jonas (jonasst@collierschools.com)
PLC meetings to analyze standards to align instruction with the rigor of the standards.	
Person Responsible	Kimberly Mannari (mannak@collierschools.com)
ESE and ELL support strategically scheduled into grade levels and be part of collaborative planning.	
Person Responsible	Stephanie Jonas (jonasst@collierschools.com)

Classroom observations with a focus on evidence-based strategies

Person Responsible Stephanie Jonas (jonasst@collierschools.com)

Embed professional development on differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible Stephanie Jonas (jonasst@collierschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our Area of Focus is to Increase Overall Learning Gains in ELA. This area has decreased in the last 5 school years from 59% making gains to 52% making gains and had a 6% decrease from 2019-2021. By focusing on Increasing Learning Gains in ELA, we intend to increase the percentage of students who make learning gains in Math by 5%, from 52% to 57% making learning gains measured by the school year 2022 FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	By June 2022, If students are consistently engaged in differentiated cognitively complex activities, utilizing HMH Resources and by following the district scope and sequence, that require active processing and engagement, then the overall learning gains of students will increase by 5%, from 52%-57%, in ELA.
Monitoring:	Student growth will be monitored by the SPE Leadership Team, through ELA assessments (iReady (Weekly), Module Assessments (Following District Curriculum Guide), and Quarter Benchmark Assessments (Quarterly). SPE Leadership Team will respond with interventions or changes as needed from our data analysis. Lesson plans will be reviewed by the school administrative team and lesson plans will include differentiated instruction, ELL, ESE and enrichment strategies. Student tasks will be analyzed during collaborative planning, weekly, by the administrative team to ensure they are grade level appropriate, aligned with the standard and engaging. On-going coaching cycles will occur from our Literacy Specialist.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kimberly Mannari (mannak@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	- Reciprocal teaching - Exit slips - Question-Answer Relationships
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	- The teacher and students take turns leading a dialogue regarding segments of the text. Students discuss with their teacher how to apply four comprehension strategies—generating questions, summarizing, clarifying, and predicting—to passages of text. - The Exit-Slip strategy requires students to write responses to questions you pose at the end of class. Exit Slips help students reflect on what they have learned and express what or how they are thinking about the new information. Exit Slips easily incorporate writing into your content area classroom and require students to think critically. - Question-Answer relationship (QAR) is a strategy to be used after students have read. QAR teaches students how to decipher what types of questions they are being asked and where to find the answers to them. Four types of questions are examined in the QAR.

Action Steps to Implement	
Grade Level Collaborative planning with reading coach and administration specifically focused on ELA.	
Person Responsible	Debra Phillips (phillide@collierschools.com)
PLC meetings to analyze standards to align instruction with the rigor of the standards.	
Person Responsible	Stephanie Jonas (jonasst@collierschools.com)

ESE and ELL support strategically scheduled into grade levels and be part of collaborative planning and provides additional support during the DI block.

Person Responsible Stephanie Jonas (jonasst@collierschools.com)

Administration will be present for instructional planning sessions.

Person Responsible Stephanie Jonas (jonasst@collierschools.com)

Lesson plans will be monitored for grade level appropriate student tasks.

Person Responsible Kimberly Mannari (mannak@collierschools.com)

Classroom observations with a focus on evidence-based strategies.

Person Responsible Stephanie Jonas (jonasst@collierschools.com)

Progress monitoring of data to make instructional adjustments and provide coaching.

Person Responsible Kimberly Mannari (mannak@collierschools.com)

Student data binders will be utilized to track progress and set goals.

Person Responsible Stephanie Jonas (jonasst@collierschools.com)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our Area of Focus is to Increase Learning Gains in Math, Lowest 25%. Even though we increased in the percent making gains, lowest 25%, from 33% to 39% from 2019-2021, we decreased in the last 5 school years from 45% making gains, lowest 25%, to 39% making gains, lowest 25%. This is still a low performing area where we can make adequate growth. By focusing on Increasing Learning Gains in Math, we intend to increase the percentage of students who make learning gains in the Lowest 25% in Math by 5%, from 39% to 44% making learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	By June 2022, If students who identify as our lowest 25% in Math are consistently engaged in differentiated cognitively complex activities, utilizing HMH Resources and by following the district scope and sequence, that require active processing and engagement, then the learning gains of our lowest 25% in Math will increase by 5%, from 39%-44%.
Monitoring:	The Administrative team will build a co-teach, departmentalization model where students who identify as the lowest 25% in Math will receive direct instruction from their classroom teacher as well as another instructional support member, daily. SPE Leadership Team will monitor the following, bi-weekly; HMH Math Module Assessments, HMH Math growth monitoring tool and ALEKS math program. In addition, SPE Leadership Team will analyze our Quarter 1, 2, & 3 Benchmark Assessments, quarterly, and respond with interventions or changes as needed from our data analysis. Administration will ensure lesson plans are reviewed weekly and include differentiated instruction, ELL, ESE, and enrichment strategies.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	-Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) -Implement tasks that promote reasoning and problem solving -Support productive struggle in learning mathematics -Pose purposeful questions
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	-MTSS is an evidence-based framework for effectively integrating multiple systems and services to simultaneously address students' academic achievement, behavior, and social-emotional well-being. -Engage students in solving and discussing tasks that promote mathematical reasoning and problem solving and allow multiple entry points and varied solution strategies. -Consistently provide students, individually and collectively, with opportunities and supports to engage in productive struggle as they grapple with mathematical ideas and relationships. -Use purposeful questions to assess and advance students' reasoning and sense making about important mathematical ideas and relationships.

Action Steps to Implement	
1. Professional Development in effective math instruction and intervention strategies.	
Person Responsible	Stephanie Jonas (jonasst@collierschools.com)
MTSS meetings regularly scheduled to ensure monitoring of L25.	
Person Responsible	Kimberly Mannari (mannak@collierschools.com)

Data chats with grade level teams regarding individual student data to move them along a continuum, monitoring their progress throughout the year based on common and district assessments.

Person Responsible Stephanie Jonas (jonasst@collierschools.com)

Monitor students performing in the lowest 25% according to sub-skills and provide targeted intervention and support.

Person Responsible Kimberly Mannari (mannak@collierschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

N/A